

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed concurrently with a RCE and addresses issues raised in the Final Office Action dated January 6, 2005. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-15 and 18-21 are now in the application.

Claims 1-5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasui et al (JP 06-341837). Claim 1 has been amended to include additional limitations. The claim now recites the “reference object detecting means...” and the “means for identifying a condition of change...” The changes to claim 1 specify the calculation of the correction amount. Prior to this amendment, the “first parameter” described in claim 1 may not have been fully and completely described. Also, the correcting method was not set forth in detail. As amended, however, claim 1 is more detailed and clearly specifies how correction takes place.

More specifically, described in terms of the formulas set forth in our specification, DP of $Z = KZH / (d-DP)$ for calculating the parallax is continuously corrected. The cited references merely suggest $Z = Lf / (\text{sum of right and left parallaxes})$, and do not teach correcting DP. Amended claim 1 defines the calculating method of DP and thus distinguishes over the references in a patentable way.

Claims 11-15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui et al (JP 06-341837). Claim 11 has also been amended to include additional limitations. The claim now recites the “reference object detecting means...” and the “means for identifying a condition of change...” The changes to claim 1 specify the calculation of the correction amount. As with claim 1, Amended claim 11 clearly defines the calculating method of DP.

Claims 6, 9, 10, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui et al (JP 06-341837) in view of Saneyoshi et al (US Patent 5,410,346). In view of the limitations added to independent claims 1 and 11, they and these dependent claims should patentably define over the combined teachings of these references.

Claims 7 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui et al (JP 06-341837) in view of Saneyoshi et al (US Patent 5,410,346) and further in view of Azuma et al (US Patent 6,163,337). In view of the limitations added to independent claims 1 and 11, they and these dependent claims should patentably define over the combined teachings of these references.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui et al (JP 06-341837) in view of Kise (JP 10-307352). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed. Yasui et al disclose a structure for calculating a correction amount of a camera based on the locus of a vanishing point. However, it does not teach how to correct the vanishing point itself. The Kise reference discloses performing image transformation based on a deviation between images. However, it also does not teach how to correct the vanishing point. Thus, even combining the teachings of these two references, there is no teaching as to how to correct the vanishing point, especially, correcting based on a vanishing point previously established and a vanishing point obtained by an approximating line.

Claim 20 recites that a vanishing point previously established is corrected based on the distinction between a vanishing point calculated from a lane model and the vanishing point previously established. The cited references, however, do not teach correcting the vanishing point. Yasui et al teach only the structure of calculating a camera correction amount by the movement locus of a vanishing point. Kise teaches a method of calculating a

parameter of image transformation. Even if these references are combined, they do not teach the combination expressed by claim 20. The Examiner does not explain how one of ordinary skill in the art would use the teachings of these two references to achieve what is expressed by our claim 20.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui et al (JP 06-341837) and Kise (JP 10-307352) further in view of Saneyoshi et al (US Patent 5,410,346). This claim depends from and further limits claim 20, believed to be allowable as discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300.

* * *

If any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 032405.056.

If an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is necessary that is not accounted for in the papers filed herewith, such an extension is requested. The extension fee should be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300; Order No. 032405.056.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:



Glenn J. Perry, Reg. No. 28,458
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202/973-2611
Facsimile: 202/263-4311

Date: June 2, 2005
GJP/jjk